

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 20, 21, 30, and 31 have been amended. Claims 20-23 and 26-33 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

The statement that claims 30-33 would be allowable if written in independent form is gratefully acknowledged. Claims 30 and 31 have been so rewritten.

Claims 20-23 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,044,057 ("Park"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 20 and 21, as amended, recite, *inter alia*, "a pivot comprising a pin having a rounded tip end which engages the pivot-receiving member." Park does not disclose this feature. The Office Action has characterized the first and second shafts 501 and 502 disclosed by Part (column 4, lines 66-67) as pins. (Office Action, page 3). However, Park does not disclose that the first and second shafts 501 and 502 are part of a pivot. Instead, Park discloses that the first and second shafts 501 and 502 are supports and that the "optical pickup 320 is transferred in the radius direction of the turntable 311 along the first and second shafts 501 and 502 by an optical pickup driving device 330." (column 5, lines 2-5). Since Park does not disclose all the limitations of claims 20 and 21, claims 20 and 21 are not anticipated by Park.

Claims 22 and 23 recite, *inter alia*, "each of said support mechanisms having a pivot-receiving member." Park does not disclose this feature. The Office Action has characterized "the complex adjusting device 360" (column 6, lines 11-12) and the "phase adjusting body 351" (column 5, line 35) as pivot-receiving members. (Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization because the

complex adjusting device 360 and the phase adjusting body 351 do not receive a pivot and therefore cannot be characterized as pivot-receiving members. As discussed above with regard to claims 20 and 21, the first and second shafts 501 and 502 are not part of a pivot.

Furthermore, claims 22 and 23 recite, *inter alia*, "at least two support mechanisms respectively configured to support the chassis in a manner free to tilt with respect to the base body." Park does not disclose this feature and the Office Action has not addressed this limitation. The Office Action has characterized "the deck 300" (column 4, line 67) taught by Park as a base body. (Office Action, page 3). Even assuming, *arguendo*, that this characterization is correct, Park does not teach a chassis that is supported in a manner free to tilt with respect to the base body. Since Park does not disclose all the limitations of claims 22 and 23, claims 22 and 23 are not anticipated by Park.

Claims 26, 27, 28, and 29 depend from claims 20, 21, 22, and 23, respectively, and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 20-23 and 26-29 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

David Beck

Registration No.: 54,985

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant